investing money on valuable security, a period of four months counting from the date of purchase may be prescribed for the use of stamp papers for the execution of documents and a rule may be passed prohibiting the recognition of documents executed after that period.

Reply of Government.—Cannot be done.

SUBJECT No. 52.

Deposits in revenue or civil court sales.

Mr. Honnalige Gowda, Gubbi taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Either in a revenue sale or in a civil court sale 25% of the money has to be first deposited by the purchaser and the balance of 75% within 15 days from that date. Some poor ignorant people do not know this rule and they often get their deposit money forfeited by not paying the balance within the prescribed time. It is prayed that this time of 15 days may be extended to one month.

Reply of Government.—The period of 15 days seems to be long enough. It cannot be extended.

SUBJECT No. 53.

The accused to be furnished with copies of complaint.

Messrs. Mahomed Imam Sab, Mir Mahomed Sab, and Subba Rao, Tarikere taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Just as in civil cases, the accused in criminal cases may be furnished with copies of complaints along with the summons. The present practice of obtaining copies of such complaints on the presentation of petitions causes hardship.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

SUBJECT No. 54.

Complainants to be summoned and heard in criminal appeals.

Messrs. Veene Rangaswami Iyengar Krishnasetti and W. Subbaraya Mudaliar, Seringapatam taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Criminal appeals are disposed of without notice to the complainant. It is prayed that orders be issued to summon and hear them in criminal appeals as in civil cases.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 55.

Execution of bailable warrants.

Mr. Channappa, Channagiri taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Police constables are at present entrusted with the execution of warrants on accused persons in cases in which bail has to be furnished. As constables are not empowered to accept bail, respectable persons are very often put to much annoyance on this account. It is therefore prayed that warrants may be given for execution to officials empowered to accept bail.

Reply of Government.—Orders have been issued recently on 27th September 1912, requesting the Inspector-General of Police to issue needful instructions for literate constables who can take bail being entrusted with the execution of warrants whenever higher officers cannot be available for this duty.

SUBJECT No. 56.

Jurisdiction of civil courts.

Mr. V. Raghavachar, Pavagada taluk.

Summary of discussion.—In suits relating to the possession of lands, the jurisdiction of civil courts is fixed at five times the assessment of the land in dispute. On account of this, suits relating to valuable lands are

decided by civil courts of a lower status and thus room is given to much inconvenience and irregularities. It is therefore requested that orders may be issued to fix the jurisdiction of the courts upon the value of the land and not upon its assessment.

Messrs. J. Subba Rao, Malali Venkataramiah, K. Ramanuja Iyengar, H. Surasastri, S. Ramanna, D. Alasingrachar, K. Ramanna, H. Krishnappa and C. Narasimhiah, opposed the proposal on the ground that the existing rule is working smoothly, that no inconvenience is felt, and that the introduction of an Act like the Suits Valuation Act for the purpose of determining the jurisdiction of the court would only enable the defendant to put forward frivolous pleas and thus cause delay in the disposal of suits.

Reply of Government.—The existing rule will not be changed.

SUBJECT No. 57.

Revival of the Rule of Practice, *re* search of Registry, by decree-holders in execution of sales.

Messrs. S. Ramanna, Hassan Municipality, and Maralusiddappa, Hassan District Board.

Summary of discussion.—The civil courts sell the right, title and interest of the judgment-debtor at the instance of the decree-holder. Under the present Rule of Practice, the decree-holders are not required to cause a search to be made in the Registry Office to ascertain whether any encumbrances are created by the judgment-debtors, in respect of properties to be sold by the court. Under Order XXI, Rule 66 (*c*), the proclamation of sale should specify, fairly and accurately, among other things, any encumbrance to which the property is liable. Unless a search is made in the Registry Office, the provision of Law will not be accurately complied with. The purchaser looks to the proclamation of sale for material particulars. If there is any misstatement of facts, the purchaser suffers loss. It is therefore prayed that the old Rule of Practice, dated 20th December 1880, requiring the decree-holder to cause a search to be made in the Registry Office may be revived.

Mr. Amble Anniah Pandit opposed the suggestion on the ground that the existing procedure is simple and works no hardship either to the parties or to the purchaser in auction.

Reply of Government.—The new rule was only recently made by the Chief Court. They will however be again consulted.

SUBJECT No. 58.

Rule of Practice issued by the Chief Court on the civil side.

Messrs. M. L. Narasimhachar, Hassan District Board, and Yajaman Ramabhatta, Kadur District Board.

Withdrawn.